

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/665,241	09/19/2003	Leo Jaw	CFP-2185 (15722/576)	6928	
23595	7590 05/12/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A. 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			PIERCE, JI	PIERCE, JEREMY R	
SUITE 820	AVENUE SOUTH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOI	IS, MN 55402		1771		
			DATE MAILED: 05/12/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/665,241	JAW, LEO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeremy R. Pierce	1771				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of this will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timel NTHS from the mailing date of this c BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ The	nis action is non-final.					
* *	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	·					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	·				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C	, ,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in a riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT0 	O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,234) in view of Kawabata et al. (JP 07-03638, Derwent English translation of the Abstract provided).

Greenberg discloses a flexible band made from woven material comprising nylon or other synthetic yarn and an elastic yarn (column 2, lines 63-67). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use rubber yarn as the elastic yarn in Greenberg, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Greenberg does not disclose using split compound yarn. Kawabata et al. teach that splittable conjugate fiber can be used in either the weft or warp of woven fabric to provide increased fullness and excellent touch and drape (Abstract). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a splittable fiber in the band of Greenberg in order to provide a band with improved fullness and better touch, as taught by Kawabata et al.

With regard to claims 2-16, these dependent claims contain limitations directed to methods of splitting the fibers. However, the claims themselves are directed to a woven band. "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

With regard to claim 17, Greenberg teaches using the band on the wrist (column 10, line 13). With regard to claim 18, recitation that the band is a headband is a recitation of an intended use and is not given patentable weight. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the band as a headband in order to provide a support band for an injury to the head. With regard to claims 19 and 20, Kawabata et al. teach the conjugate fiber is formed from polyester and polyamide (Abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeremy R. Pierce whose telephone number is (571) 272-1479. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 9am and 5pm.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeremy R. Pierce May 2, 2005

> ELIZABETH M. COLE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4